

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

TONY DEJUAN JACKSON,

Case No. 23-CV-0168 (PJS/DJF)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

PAUL SCHNELL and GUY BOSCH,

Defendants.

---

Tony Dejuan Jackson, pro se.

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff Tony Dejuan Jackson's objection to the April 13, 2023 Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of Magistrate Judge Dulce J. Foster. ECF No. 13. Judge Foster recommends dismissing Jackson's claims without prejudice and denying Jackson's pending motions at Docket Nos. 6, 7, and 11 as moot. The Court has conducted a de novo review. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Based on that review, the Court overrules Jackson's objection and adopts Judge Foster's R&R.

Only one matter merits comment. As Judge Foster noted, Jackson has filed a motion to consolidate the claims in this case with the claims asserted in *Jackson v. Schnell*, No. 23-CV-0366 (PJS/DTS), a case in which he has paid the filing fee. *See* ECF No. 6. Jackson's motion is clearly an attempt circumvent the PLRA's strictures on three-

strikes litigants by simply transferring claims from this action (in which he has not paid his filing fee) to another action (in which he has paid his filing fee).

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allow joinder of claims against multiple defendants only if there would be claims against all defendants that “aris[e] out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences.” Fed R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2)(A). As Judge Foster observed, Jackson’s complaint in this case is simply a “laundry list of generally unrelated grievances.” R&R 1. Jackson is well known in this District for filing such “kitchen-sink” pleadings. *See, e.g., Jackson v. FindJodi.com, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-1777 (SRN/LIB), 2021 WL 7542396, at \*6 (D. Minn. Nov. 8, 2021), *adopted*, 2022 WL 336832, *aff’d*, 2022 WL 4455209; *Jackson v. Schnell*, No. 22-CV-0965 (WMW/JFD), 2022 WL 17418038, at \*2 (D. Minn. Aug. 19, 2022), *adopted*, 2022 WL 17091170. The suit into which he seeks to consolidate his claims here exhibits the same problem. *See* R&R 7–8, *Jackson v. Schnell*, No. 23-cv-0366 (PJS/DTS), ECF No. 13. Tacking this laundry list of claims onto another laundry list of claims will not bring either complaint into compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

#### ORDER

Based on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, the Court OVERRULES plaintiff’s objection [ECF No. 14] and ADOPTS the R&R [ECF No. 13]. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Jackson's amended complaint [ECF No. 4] is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

2. Jackson's pending motions [ECF Nos. 6, 7, 11] are DENIED as moot.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: May 24, 2023

s/Patrick J. Schiltz

Patrick J. Schiltz, Chief Judge  
United States District Court